REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 24, 2004. Claims 1, 4-21, 24-41, 44-60, and 81-83 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 21, and 41 are in independent form and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. In addition, dependent Claims 15, 24-27, 29-32, 35, 46, 50-52 and 55 have been amended as to purely formal matters. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 4-6, 13-21, 24-26, 33-41, 44-46, 53-60 and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,790,119 (Sklut et al) in view of U.S. Patent 5,353,399 (Kuwamoto et al.). Claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 28, 29, 31, 32, 48, 49, 51 and 52 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from those two patents and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,996,029 (Sugiyama et al.); Claims 10, 30 and 50, as being obvious from *Sklut* and *Kuwamoto* further in view of U.S. Patent 6,147,770 (Unishi et al.); and Claims 7, 27 and 47, as being obvious from *Sklut* and *Kuwamoto* further in view of U.S. Patent 6,011,553 (Komiyama).

In Applicant's response to this rejection of the independent claims in Applicant's last Amendment, Applicant argued that the prior art does not teach or suggest the obtaining means recited in Claim 1 (or corresponding recitations in the other independent claims). In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner responds that in his view the "obtaining means for obtaining peripheral device information" of Claim 1 does not require that the device information

is obtained via the network. Applicant understands the Examiner's comment as a suggestion to add an explicit recitation to this effect, and now adopts that suggestion.

Since the obtaining means as recited is not found in *Sklut* (or the other art of record), the claimed system display means and designation means, which operate based on the information obtained by the obtaining means, also are not taught or suggested.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1, and the other independent claims, which are respectively a method and a memory-medium claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, are believed clearly to be allowable over the art applied against the claims.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action merely (1) adopts the Examiner's suggestion and (2) makes purely formal changes to certain of the dependent claims, and therefore, its entry is

believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 448510v1